

Head Constables, and 6 Police Constables has been provided for that area for over a year.

Sri C. S. HULKOTI.—At what place protection has been given?

Sri C. M. POONACHA.—They are put in charge of that area and they are going round and exercising constant vigilance and also keeping track of criminals in that particular area.

Sri C. S. HULKOTI.—May I know whether there has been any improvement after the protection is being given?

Sri C. M. POONACHA.—After the special squad has been sent, there has been a good deal of improvement in the crime position in that area.

Sri C. S. HULKOTI.—May I know whether some cases are still pending decision of the court?

Sri C. M. POONACHA.—Yes. Out of these 30 cases enumerated there are as many as 10 cases pending trial.

ಶ್ರೀ. ಎ. ಕಂಬು.—19 ಗಳಿಂದ 5 ತಾಂತ್ರಾ ನಾಗಿ 14 ಉಳಿದಿರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರಣವೇನು?

Sri C. M. POONACHA.—Out of these 19 cases of theft, 14 cases are still under investigation and 4 cases are pending trial. One case, of course, ended in conviction and five cases have been charge-sheeted.

ಶ್ರೀ. ಎಂ. ಎಸ್. ಪೂನಾಚಾ.—19 ಗಳಿಂದ 5 ತಾಂತ್ರಾ ನಾಗಿ 14 ಉಳಿದಿರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರಣವೇನು?

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಅ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಬಿಂದಿಲ್ಲ.

Construction of a Warehouse at Arsikere.

Q.—1942 Dr. A. R. KARISIDDAPPA (Arsikere).—

Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(a) whether a decision was taken some time back to build a warehouse at Arsikere;

(b) if so, the reasons for not constructing the same?

A.—Sri S. NIJALINGAPPA (Chief Minister).—

(a) Arsikere was one of the places in which a warehouse was proposed to be located.

(b) The State Warehousing Corporation which will be entrusted with the work of constructing warehouses in the State will consider the question after it starts functioning.

Dr. A. R. KARISIDDAPPA.—May I know when it was proposed to locate that warehouse at Arsikere?

Sri S. NIJALINGAPPA.—As far as I remember, it was proposed five months back.

Dr. A. R. KARISIDDAPPA.—May I know whether the State Warehousing Corporation is functioning now?

Sri S. NIJALINGAPPA.—Yes.

Dr. A. R. KARISIDDAPPA.—May I know the estimated cost of construction in respect of this warehouse to be constructed at Arsikere?

Sri S. NIJALINGAPPA.—I want notice for that question.

Sri G. SIVAPPA.—May I know who is the Chairman of this Warehousing Corporation?

Sri S. NIJALINGAPPA.—It has been published in the Gazette.

Mr. SPEAKER.—We will now take up Short Notice Question No. 130.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—According to the Order Paper, we have to take up the 13th List and then this Short Notice Question.

Mr. SPEAKER.—That does not mean that the 13th List should be exhausted and then this Short Notice Question should be taken up. It only means that within the question hour ordinary questions would be taken up and after the question hour this Short Notice Question would be taken up.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Being an important question, I request the Chair to allow us an opportunity to put supplementaries on this question.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Of course, it is an important question, but it cannot be important to you and to me only. It must also be important to the Hon'ble Member who tabled it. He is not here and so what can I do?

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—The entire House is interested in this matter. Therefore, I request the Chair to take up this matter.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I do understand that the entire House or at least a major part is interested in this question but then the main point is that the Hon'ble Member who tabled it is not here. It appears he is not interested in it.

Sri U. M. MADAPPA.—The Chair can put it in the interest of the House. There is a provision to that effect in the Rules.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Why should I do it?

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—The majority of this section is very much interested in it.

Mr. SPEAKER.—After all, I should not be made an instrument in such matters. The Hon'ble Member who tabled it must have been very careful. He must have been present. However, in view of the question being a matter of urgent public importance, I put it myself.

SHORT NOTICE QUESTION AND ANSWER.

Criminal Assault on a Woman by the staff of the Seshadripuram Police Station.

†Q.—130. **Sri T. PARTHASARATHY** (Malleswaram).—

Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(a) whether it is true that criminal assault was committed by the staff of the Seshadripuram Police Station recently on a woman, resulting in her death later in hospital;

(b) the steps they propose to take against these officials;

(c) whether they will appoint a high-power committee to probe into this matter?

A.—**Sri C. M. POONACHA** (Minister for Home Affairs and Industries).—

- (a) No.
- (b) Does not arise.
- (c) No.

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—I rise to a point of order, Sir. This question has something to do with the ruling which the Hon'ble Speaker was pleased to give some time ago. In the light of that, I would like to be enlightened as to how this question became admissible.

Mr. SPEAKER.—That means the Hon'ble Member has not understood the ruling I gave in this matter. I said that this matter is not *sub judice*.

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—Sir, I followed very well the Punjab decision which threw this matter open for discussion, but the Hon'ble Speaker was pleased to tell us that there were certain rulings of this House which would have to be respected. In the light of that, it is not desirable that this discussion should take place. Therefore, in the light of the rulings of this House, I want to know whether this question becomes admissible.

Mr. SPEAKER.—What I said has not been properly understood by the Hon'ble Member. What I said was that I was disallowing the adjournment motion on the ground that there were other parliamentary methods open to Hon'ble Members for raising this subject. I also indicated then that there was a short notice question tabled on this subject by one of the Hon'ble Members.

Sri V. SRINIVAS SHETTY.—Is it not a fact that one woman by name Muniyamma was arrested and taken to the Seshadripuram Police Station and questioned on the 18th?

Sri C. M. POONACHA.—That is not so. No person by name Muniyamma was arrested on that day. On the other hand, one Mrs. Sarojamma, wife of Chinnathambi, went to the Police Station and lodged a complaint to the effect that she has lost one of her ear rings. They had taken one Muniyamma along with them and they suspected Muniyamma of having taken that ear ring. This complaint was lodged and an enquiry was made. It was not a proved case of theft because it was an incident of losing a thing. It was a non-cognisable offence. An entry was

† The question was put by the Chair.